

From: [1490Comments](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: FW: Feedback on the Proposed MLS
Date: Wednesday, December 09, 2015 1:02:55 PM
Attachments: [EnglishLanguageArts-FeedbackonProposedMLS.pdf](#)
[ATT00001.htm](#)
[Mathematics-FeedbackonProposedMLS.pdf](#)
[ATT00002.htm](#)
[Science-FeedbackonProposedMLS.pdf](#)
[ATT00003.htm](#)
[SocialStudies-FeedbackonProposedMLS.pdf](#)
[ATT00004.htm](#)

From: Fowler, Amy [mailto:FowlerA@OSAGESCHOOLS.ORG]
Sent: Wednesday, December 02, 2015 4:59 PM
To: 1490Comments
Cc: Nelson, Laura
Subject: Feedback on the Proposed MLS

I have attached the feedback from the teachers of my school district. I appreciate all of the time that has been put in by all four work groups. Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

English Language Arts
Feedback on Proposed MLS

Please use the following scale to provide feedback & provide any suggested revisions for standards:

1 Standards are acceptable as is. Overall the standards are listed at the appropriate grade level.	2 Standards are acceptable, edits would improve, but are not mandatory. Very few (minor) issues.	3 Standards are acceptable <i>after</i> they are revised as suggested immediately below.	4 Standards require complete rewrite. Majority of standards are at <i>inappropriate</i> grade levels
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

English Language Arts K-5									
Strand	G R A D E	1. The standards in this strand are <u>developmentally appropriate</u> .	2. The standards in this strand follow a <u>coherent path through and across all grade levels</u> .	3. The standards set a <u>rigorous path of high expectations</u> for students at each grade level.	4. The majority of the standards in this strand can be <u>assessed in the classroom and/or on a state assessment</u> .	5. The standards in this strand are <u>understandable</u> to educators and explainable to parents and other stakeholders.	6. The standards in this strand represent the necessary content for a student to reach <u>college and/or career readiness upon graduation</u> .	7. The standards in this strand are <u>accurate and encompass the breadth of the content</u> .	Overall comments regarding the proposed standards:
Reading Foundations	K - 2	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	RF1Aa Kdg Should read recognize and name rather than identifying.
		1	1	3	1	1	1	1	RF1Ac Kdg Should read follow words from left to right not understand.
		1	1	3	1	1	1	1	RF1Aa 1st Should read recognize and name not

								identify.
		3	1	1	1	1	1	RF1Ad 1st move this standard to kdg.
		3	1	1	1	1	1	RF1Ae 1st and Kdg not just 1st
		3	1	1	1	1	1	RF1Ag 1st move to Kdg not 1st
		1	1	1	1	3	1	RF2Ae Kdg should read CVC words not simple words
		1	3	1	1	1	1	RF2Af,g,h should be reorganized. Put g first, then h, then f
		1	1	1	1	3	1	RF2Ag 1st should read medial vowel.
		1	3	1	1	3	1	RF3Ac Kdg provide dolch word list of 50 words
		1	3	1	1	3	1	RF3Am 1st provide dolch words list of 220 words
		4	4	4	4	4	4	RF3An 1st need to list reading strategies. Look at the picture. Reread. Read around and go back, Try both vowel sounds...
		1	1	1	1	3	1	RF3Ai 2nd What is grade

									appropriate?
		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	RF4A 1st and 2nd Provide a list of reading strategies
	3 - 5	3	4	3	2	2	2	1	RF3A 3rd-5th add a list of grade appropriate high frequency words, not coherent in the skills, the skills are in isolation and do not build upon each other
Reading	K - 2	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	R1A Kdg should include RI.K.6 from current MLS Need an awareness of author and illustrator (define and identify)
		3	3	3	1	1	1	1	R1B 1st should include L.1.4 c from current MLS
		3	3	3	1	1	1	1	R2C 1st a. needs to be moved to kindergarten
	3 - 5	4	4	4	1	2	4	4	R1A 3rd- e. Keep R1C-Take out, does not need whole standard, put connections with comprehension strategies,

									<p>R1D4-5th-Needs clarification on rigor expected at each grade level. How do teachers go deeper each year?</p> <p>R2A3rd-d.say summarize, not paraphrase, f. take out!</p> <p>R2A4th-d-h-Take ALL out, need to concentrate on comprehension at this level, let kids choose fiction and nonfiction books without tying into a specific topic or genre, keep wording from R.I 5.6, Take out R2B, Move R3Bc. to 2nd grade, R3B5thb. be more specific use RI5.6 explanation, R#Ca. 3rd- DOK level 1, change to identify and explain, R3Cb. More explanation needed for compare and</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

									contrast, R3Cc. add using textual evidence, R3C 4th-Use wording of RI4.1, b. take out, confusing, c. use wording from RI4.8, R3C 5th-add RI.5.1and RI 5.8, R4-Do not scaffold in a stair step approach to each grade level, Add RI3.5, RF3A 3rd-5th, add list of grade specific high frequency words per grade level.
Writing	K - 2	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	W1Aa 1st Include using graphic organizer.
	3 - 5	4	3	2	2	3	2	3	The research strand is not developmentally appropriate. Don't change the language and standards from the current standards.
Speaking & Listening	K - 2	3	2	2	3	1	1	1	SL1A Kdg Should still include continue a conversation through multiple exchanges.
		3	1	1	3	1	1	1	SL1A 1st should

									include b. & c. from current MLS
		3	1	1	3	1	1	1	SL1A 2nd Should include b. & c. from current MLS
		3	1	1	3	1	1	1	SL2A 1st & 2nd should include apply skill to TEXTS.
		3	1	1	3	1	1	1	SL3A Kdg & 1st & 2nd should include requesting clarification if something is not understood.
		3	1	1	3	1	1	1	SL4A Kdg add speak audibly and express thoughts, feelings, and ideas clearly.
	3 - 5	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
Language	K - 2	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	L1A 2nd a. Need to include introduce cursive but not master
		3	3	3	3	3	1	1	L1B Kdg f. Need to include the list of appropriate sight words.
		3	3	3	3	3	1	1	L1B 1st e. Need to include the list of appropriate

									sight words.
		3	3	3	3	1	1	1	L1B 2nd d. & e. move to 1st grade
		3	3	3	3	3	1	1	L1B 2nd g. & i. define grade appropriate
		3	3	3	3	3	1	1	L1A 1st a. Need to include current MLS print ALL Upper & Lowercase letters
	3 - 5	4	3	3	1	2	4	3	L1Aa. 3rd-Take cursive out or move to second grade. L1A 5th-change to demonstrate and apply, L1B 3rd-d, c, j. move back to second grade L1B4th-a. commas in series and commas with yes and no, move to 3rd,

Please use the following scale to provide feedback & provide any suggested revisions for standards:

1	2	3	4
Standards are acceptable as is. Overall the standards are listed at the appropriate grade level.	Standards are acceptable, edits would improve, but are not mandatory. Very few (minor) issues.	Standards are acceptable <i>after</i> they are revised as suggested immediately below.	Standards require complete rewrite. Majority of standards are at <i>inappropriate</i> grade levels

English Language Arts 6-12									
Strand	G R A D E	1. The standards in this strand are <u>developmentally appropriate</u> .	2. The standards in this strand follow a <u>coherent path through and across all grade levels</u> .	3. The standards set a <u>rigorous path of high expectations</u> for students at each grade level.	4. The majority of the standards in this strand can be <u>assessed in the classroom and/or on a state assessment</u> .	5. The standards in this strand are <u>understandable</u> to educators and explainable to parents and other stakeholders.	6. The standards in this strand represent the necessary content for a student to reach <u>college and/or career readiness upon graduation</u> .	7. The standards in this strand are <u>accurate and encompass the breadth of the content</u> .	Overall comments regarding the proposed standards:
Reading Literary Texts	O M S	1	3 - RL6 This does not seem to build on each other. RL 7 Word Choice in 7th grade to signify tone does correlate with 6th grade sound device to create meaning.	2	3 - RL 5 - this seems very difficult to assess the validity of this. More guidance is needed. RL11 How can this be assessed?	3 RL4.7 - distinct (this would need to be defined) RL3 - what are visual elements? RL6 Is this point of view or viewpoint?	1	1	Need a glossary of terms (not open for interpretation) including literary devices, point of view vs. viewpoint, cite
	O H S	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Language seems to match ACT language better: example "synthesize"

Reading Informational Texts	O M S	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	How would #11 be accessed? We need a glossary of terms and definitions.
	O H S	1	1	2 - The trend with testing nonfiction would seem to demand some additional rigor in this area	1	1	1	1	
Writing & Researching	O M S	2- Students don't grasp the basic grammar	1	2 - The rigor is weak in 6th grade if students do not have to look at compound and complex sentences. This will affect their writing.	1	1	1	1	
	O H S	2- Students don't grasp the basic grammar	1	2 - The rigor is weak in 6th grade if students do not have to look at compound and complex sentences. This will affect their writing.	1	1	1	1	
Speaking & Listening	O M S	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Leveling of the multimedia is a plus. Skills are easy to understand and can be assessed.
	O	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	

November, 2015
School of the Osage

	H S								
--	--------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Mathematics
Feedback on Proposed MLS

Please use the following scale to provide feedback & provide any suggested revisions for standards:

1 Standards are acceptable as is. Overall the standards are listed at the appropriate grade level.	2 Standards are acceptable, edits would improve, but are not mandatory. Very few (minor) issues.	3 Standards are acceptable <i>after</i> they are revised as suggested immediately below.	4 Standards require complete rewrite. Majority of standards are at <i>inappropriate</i> grade levels
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Mathematics K-5									
Strand	G R A D E	1. The standards in this strand are <u>developmentally appropriate</u> .	2. The standards in this strand follow a <u>coherent</u> path through and across all grade levels.	3. The standards set a <u>rigorous path of high expectations</u> for students at each grade level.	4. The majority of the standards in this strand can be <u>assessed in the classroom and/or on a state assessment</u> .	5. The standards in this strand are <u>understandable</u> to educators and explainable to parents and other stakeholders.	6. The standards in this strand represent the necessary content for a student to reach <u>college and/or career readiness</u> upon graduation.	7. The standards in this strand are <u>accurate and encompass</u> the breadth of the content.	Overall comments regarding the proposed standards:
Number Sense (K-1)	K								
	1								
Number Sense & Operations in Base Ten	K								
	1								
	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3.NBT.A.2-through 10,000 instead of 100,000 3.NBT.A.3-What is

									efficiency-clarify with specific problems and amount of time
	4	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	Questionable especially to parents
	5	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	The verbs used to assess are very broad and not specific to what the students will be asked to do on state assessments.
Number Sense & Operations in Fractions	K								
	1								
	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	3	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	3.NF.A.1-4-The verb "understand" is vague-How do you assess "understand"? We also would like to make sure that our fractions do not go over 1 on a number line.
	4	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	The language clarity is much improved for both teachers and parents.
	5	2	2	1	3	2	1	2	The verbs used to assess are very broad and

									not specific to what the students will be asked to do on state assessments.
Relationships & Algebraic Thinking	K								
	1								
	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	3	3	3	1	1	3	1	1	3.RA.A.1-The verb "interpret" is unclear. A more specific description would be helpful 3.RA.B.1-They are not developmentally ready for distributive property. 3.RA.D.1-possibly change to a two-step addition and subtraction and one-step multiplication and division (With us just learning multiplication at this level and the keywords that go with it, it would be nice to start with a smaller foundation of solving

									multiplication/division word problems)
	4	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	For parents, when examples are provided, parents will have a better understanding of the standard.
	5	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	The verbs used to assess are very broad and not specific to what the students will be asked to do on state assessments.
Geometry & Measurement	K								
	1								
	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	3	1	2	1	1	3	3	3	3.GM.A.1-2-Not a real life skill. Tiling an area is an unlikely strategy to use when finding area. Would like to see it piggyback off of our multiplication and just work on length times width. 3.GM.C.3-Take completely out for same reason

									as above. 3.GM.D.2-Clarify what the verb "understand" means There is no working with money that shows up in any standards. 2nd grade covers counting money/4th grade covers solving problems with money...but there is no work with money at our level. We would hate for them to lose this skill by not working with it.
	4	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	For parents, when examples are provided, parents will have a better understanding of the standard.
	5	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	The verbs used to assess are very broad and not specific to what the students will be asked to do on state assessments.
Data & Statistics	K								

November, 2015
School of the Osage

	1								
	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Line plots are nice for interpreting, but creating a line plot is an unrealistic skill.
	4	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	Much improved
	5	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	The verbs used to assess are very broad and not specific to what the students will be asked to do on state assessments.

Please use the following scale to provide feedback & provide any suggested revisions for standards:

1	2	3	4
Standards are acceptable as is. Overall the standards are listed at the appropriate grade level.	Standards are acceptable, edits would improve, but are not mandatory. Very few (minor) issues.	Standards are acceptable <i>after</i> they are revised as suggested immediately below.	Standards require complete rewrite. Majority of standards are at <i>inappropriate</i> grade levels

Mathematics 6-8								
Strand	1. The standards in this strand are <u>developmentally appropriate</u> .	2. The standards in this strand follow a <u>coherent path</u> through and across all grade levels.	3. The standards set a <u>rigorous path of high expectations</u> for students at each grade level.	4. The majority of the standards in this strand can be <u>assessed in the classroom and/or on a state assessment</u> .	5. The standards in this strand are <u>understandable</u> to educators and explainable to parents and other stakeholders.	6. The standards in this strand represent the necessary content for a student to reach <u>college and/or career readiness upon graduation</u> .	7. The standards in this strand are <u>accurate and encompass the breadth of the content</u> .	Overall comments regarding the proposed standards:
Ratios & Proportional Relationships (RP)	1	1	1	1	2 - It would be very helpful to have clear/specific examples integrated into the standards for clarification for teachers as well as parents and other stakeholders who may not understand or comprehend the standards as well as those in the field of	3 - Standards help a student be college ready, but do not take into account students who need to be career ready. Standards and curriculum beyond 8th grade math are not applicable to students who are choosing to enter careers right out of HS.	1	

					education.			
Number Sense & Operations (NS)	1	1	1	1	2 - It would be very helpful to have clear/specific examples integrated into the standards for clarification for teachers as well as parents and other stakeholders who may not understand or comprehend the standards as well as those in the field of education.	3 - Standards help a student be college ready, but do not take into account students who need to be career ready. Standards and curriculum beyond 8th grade math are not applicable to students who are choosing to enter careers right out of HS.	1	It was very helpful to have some examples written with the standards. We believe students are more developmentally ready to understand integers in grades 3-5 than fraction and decimals along with their operations. Fractions and decimals could be more easily implemented at the middle grade level while teaching ratios and proportional relationships. We propose delaying teaching fractions and decimals to the middle grades and replace with integers.
Expressions, Equations & Inequalities (EEI)	1	1	1	1	2 - It would be very helpful to have clear/specific examples integrated into the standards for clarification	3 - Standards help a student be college ready, but do not take into account students who need to be	1	It would be helpful to know what standards are the priority standards and what are the supporting standards, so

					for teachers as well as parents and other stakeholders who may not understand or comprehend the standards as well as those in the field of education.	career ready. Standards and curriculum beyond 8th grade math are not applicable to students who are choosing to enter careers right out of HS.		we would not have to look at two different documents. Having all the information in one document would create a more seamless understanding.
Geometry & Measurement (GM)	1	3 - Angles and angle relationships are taught heavily in 3rd and 4th grade, and are not addressed again until 7th grade. The students are not retaining the information because they are not seeing/reviewing the concepts consistently every year.	1	1	2 - It would be very helpful to have clear/specific examples integrated into the standards for clarification for teachers as well as parents and other stakeholders who may not understand or comprehend the standards as well as those in the field of education.	3 - Standards help a student be college ready, but do not take into account students who need to be career ready. Standards and curriculum beyond 8th grade math are not applicable to students who are choosing to enter careers right out of HS.	1	
Data Analysis, Statistics & Probability (DSP)	3 - 6th Grade students are not developmentally ready to understand much of what is taught in this strand at 6th grade. They can follow the methodical process to solve statistical	3 -The heart of statistics is covered in 6th grade. This is too much with all the other skills that need to be covered in 6th grade. Possible solution - teach statistics in	1	1	2 - It would be very helpful to have clear/specific examples integrated into the standards for clarification for teachers as well as parents and other stakeholders	3 - Standards help a student be college ready, but do not take into account students who need to be career ready. Standards and curriculum beyond 8th	1	

November, 2015

School of the Osage

	questions and create box plots, but they do not understand the analysis and interpretation of what they are creating/doing.	both 6th and 7th grade, and probability in 8th grade.			who may not understand or comprehend the standards as well as those in the field of education.	grade math are not applicable to students who are choosing to enter careers right out of HS.		
Functions (F)	1	1	1	1	2 - It would be very helpful to have clear/specific examples integrated into the standards for clarification for teachers as well as parents and other stakeholders who may not understand or comprehend the standards as well as those in the field of education.	3 - Standards help a student be college ready, but do not take into account students who need to be career ready. Standards and curriculum beyond 8th grade math are not applicable to students who are choosing to enter careers right out of HS.	1	

Please use the following scale to provide feedback & provide any suggested revisions for standards:

<p>1</p> <p>Standards are acceptable as is. Overall the standards are listed at the appropriate grade level.</p>	<p>2</p> <p>Standards are acceptable, edits would improve, but are not mandatory. Very few (minor) issues.</p>	<p>3</p> <p>Standards are acceptable <i>after</i> they are revised as suggested immediately below.</p>	<p>4</p> <p>Standards require complete rewrite. Majority of standards are at <i>inappropriate</i> grade levels</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Mathematics 9-12								
Strand	1. The standards in this strand are <u>developmentally appropriate</u> .	2. The standards in this strand follow a <u>coherent path</u> through and across all grade levels.	3. The standards set a <u>rigorous</u> path of high expectations for students at each grade level.	4. The majority of the standards in this strand can be <u>assessed in the classroom and/or on a state assessment</u> .	5. The standards in this strand are <u>understandable</u> to educators and explainable to parents and other stakeholders.	6. The standards in this strand represent the necessary content for a student to reach <u>college and/or career readiness upon graduation</u> .	7. The standards in this strand are <u>accurate and encompass the breadth of the content</u> .	Overall comments regarding the proposed standards:
Algebra								
Functions								
Data								
Geometry								

Science
Feedback on Proposed MLS

Please use the following scale to provide feedback & provide any suggested revisions for standards:

1 Standards are acceptable as is. Overall the standards are listed at the appropriate grade level.	2 Standards are acceptable, edits would improve, but are not mandatory. Very few (minor) issues.	3 Standards are acceptable <i>after</i> they are revised as suggested immediately below.	4 Standards require complete rewrite. Majority of standards are at <i>inappropriate</i> grade levels
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Science K-5									
Strand	G R A D E	1. The standards in this strand are <u>developmentally appropriate</u> .	2. The standards in this strand follow a <u>coherent path through and across all grade levels</u> .	3. The standards set a <u>rigorous path of high expectations for students at each grade level</u> .	4. The majority of the standards in this strand can be <u>assessed in the classroom and/or on a state assessment</u> .	5. The standards in this strand are <u>understandable</u> to educators and explainable to parents and other stakeholders.	6. The standards in this strand represent the necessary content for a student to reach <u>college and/or career readiness upon graduation</u> .	7. The standards in this strand are <u>accurate and encompass the breadth of the content</u> .	Overall comments regarding the proposed standards:
Matter & Its Interactions (PS1)	K - 1	1	1	1	1	2 - perhaps define "illustrate" in 1st grade objective, or use a different word	1	1	
	2	1	1	1 - conduct an investigation, analyze data	1	2 - maybe add an example to PS1-A for 2nd grade	1	1	took a lot of standards and compiled them into 1 broader standard
	3	1	4	1	1	1	1	3	Use current standards. Not covered in other grade levels.

	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	5	2	2	2	3	4		3	What exactly is the expectation of a model?
Motion & Stability; Forces & Interactions (PS2)	K - 1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	2	1	2 - no standard on magnetism until 3rd grade, used to be a big standard in 2nd grade	1	1	2 - again took a lot of standards and compiled them into 1 broader standard without examples	1	1	Only thing I see in 2nd grade that has to do with magnets is sorting...
	3	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	
	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	5	2	2	3	3	3		3 - Very simple	What exactly is the expectation of an argument?
Energy (PS3)	K - 1	N/A							
	2								
	3								
	4	3	4 - Where are the units-there are just fragments of units scattered throughout	1	2	2	1	1	
	5	2	2	PS3-B not rigorous PS3C is rigorous	3	3		3	What are the expectations of a model? Are formulas required?
Waves & Applications	K -	1	3 - PS4-A is the same objective	1	3 - include examples of how	1	1	1	

in Technology for Information Transfers (PS4)	1		in kindergarten and 1st grade		to assess this strand				
	2	1	1	1	1	2 - add examples??	1	1	same as before - lots of specific standard combined into 1 broader standard
	3								
	4	4	4	2	2	2	2	2	
	5	3	3	3	3	3		3	What exactly is the expectation of a model? Very vague!
From Molecules to Organisms: Structure & Process (LS1)	K - 1	4 - 1st grade's objectives are very difficult to understand which makes all of these areas difficult to judge	4	4	4	4	4	4	
	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	no change
	3	1	4	2	1	2	1	2	Not covered in other grades. Needs to be more specific for types of animals being compared.
	4	4	4	1	3	2	2	1	
	5	2	4 - Vertebrate/Invertebrate?????	1	3	2		2	Needs to say skeletal. What is the expectation for an argument!
Ecosystems: Interactions, Energy, & Dynamics (LS2)	K - 1								
	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	only change is the addition of

[illegible]

									needed for expectations. Unified vocabulary of terms and their meanings. Where is the engineering and technology? Unwrapping the standard will not be consist through grade levels in district and out of the district.
Earth's Place in the Universe (ESS1)	K - 1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	2	1	1	1	1	2 - explain "Earth events"	1	1	like this wording much better
	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	4	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	5	3	3	3	3	3		3	Argument and what is expected of a graphical display?
Earth's Systems (ESS2)	K - 1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	added standards dealing with preventing erosion and where water can be found on Earth
	3	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	Move to a lower grade.

	4	4	3	1	4 - only through observation	1	1	1	
	5	1	1	1	1	1		1	
Earth & Human Activity (ESS3)	K - 1								This is only addressed in kindergarten. It may be problematic for the sustainability of our environment to not have this addressed again.
	2								removed how humans use rocks and soil
	3								
	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	5	3	3	3	3	3			What does the term science ideas mean?

Please use the following scale to provide feedback & provide any suggested revisions for standards:

1	2	3	4
Standards are acceptable as is. Overall the standards are listed at the appropriate grade level.	Standards are acceptable, edits would improve, but are not mandatory. Very few (minor) issues.	Standards are acceptable <i>after</i> they are revised as suggested immediately below.	Standards require complete rewrite. Majority of standards are at <i>inappropriate</i> grade levels

Science 6-8								
Strand	1. The standards in this strand are <u>developmentally appropriate</u> .	2. The standards in this strand follow a <u>coherent path</u> through and across all grade levels.	3. The standards set a <u>rigorous</u> path of high expectations for students at each grade level.	4. The majority of the standards in this strand can be <u>assessed in the classroom and/or on a state assessment</u> .	5. The standards in this strand are <u>understandable</u> to educators and explainable to parents and other stakeholders.	6. The standards in this strand represent the necessary content for a student to reach <u>college and/or career readiness upon graduation</u> .	7. The standards in this strand are <u>accurate and encompass the breadth of the content</u> .	Overall comments regarding the proposed standards:
Matter & Its Interactions (MS-PS1)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Motion & Stability; Forces & Interactions (MS-PS2)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Energy (MS-PS3)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Waves & Applications in Technology for Information Transfers	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	

(MS-PS4)								
From Molecules to Organisms: Structure & Process (MS-LS1)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Ecosystems: Interactions, Energy, & Dynamics (MS-LS2)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Heredity & Inheritance: Variation of Traits (MS-LS3)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Biological Evolution: Unity & Diversity (MS-LS4)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Earth's Place in the Universe (MS-ESS1)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Earth's Systems (MS-ESS2)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Earth & Human Activity (MS-ESS3)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	

Please use the following scale to provide feedback & provide any suggested revisions for standards:

<p>1</p> <p>Standards are acceptable as is. Overall the standards are listed at the appropriate grade level.</p>	<p>2</p> <p>Standards are acceptable, edits would improve, but are not mandatory. Very few (minor) issues.</p>	<p>3</p> <p>Standards are acceptable <i>after</i> they are revised as suggested immediately below.</p>	<p>4</p> <p>Standards require complete rewrite. Majority of standards are at <i>inappropriate</i> grade levels</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Science 9-12								
Strand	1. The standards in this strand are <u>developmentally appropriate</u> .	2. The standards in this strand follow a <u>coherent path</u> through and across all grade levels.	3. The standards set a <u>rigorous</u> path of high expectations for students at each grade level.	4. The majority of the standards in this strand can be <u>assessed in the classroom and/or on a state assessment</u> .	5. The standards in this strand are <u>understandable</u> to educators and explainable to parents and other stakeholders.	6. The standards in this strand represent the necessary content for a student to reach <u>college and/or career readiness upon graduation</u> .	7. The standards in this strand are <u>accurate and encompass the breadth of the content</u> .	Overall comments regarding the proposed standards:
Matter & Its Interactions (HS-PS1)	2 - see overall comments	1	1	1	1	1	1	HS PS1-4: too high of a level for physical science
Motion & Stability; Forces & Interactions (HS-PS2)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Will students be able to use calculators on the state assessment?
Energy (HS-PS3)	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	HS PS3-1: do not understand what students are suppose to know
Waves & Applications in Technology	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	

for Information Transfers (HS-PS4)								
From Molecules to Organisms: Structure & Process (HS-LS1)	1 - We feel that teaching cellular organelles in the MS is not developmentally appropriate. An introduction to this suitable but mastery is not developmentally appropriate in the MS.	3 - there are gaps in content between MS and HS	1	1	3 - HS-LS2 is not clear	1	1	HS-LS1 covers content that will need reinforcement by high school teachers (specifically with cellular organelles and cell transport)
Ecosystems: Interactions, Energy, & Dynamics (HS-LS2)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Translation is good
Heredity & Inheritance: Variation of Traits (HS-LS3)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Translation is good
Biological Evolution: Unity & Diversity (HS-LS4)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Translation is good
Earth's Place in the Universe (HS-ESS1)								
Earth's Systems (HS-ESS2)								
Earth &								

November, 2015
School of the Osage

Human Activity (HS-ESS3)								
--------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Social Studies
Feedback on Proposed MLS

Please use the following scale to provide feedback & provide any suggested revisions for standards:

1 Standards are acceptable as is. Overall the standards are listed at the appropriate grade level.	2 Standards are acceptable, edits would improve, but are not mandatory. Very few (minor) issues.	3 Standards are acceptable <i>after</i> they are revised as suggested immediately below.	4 Standards require complete rewrite. Majority of standards are at <i>inappropriate</i> grade levels
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Social Studies K-5									
Strand	G R A D E	1. The standards in this strand are <u>developmentally appropriate</u> .	2. The standards in this strand follow a <u>coherent</u> path through and across all grade levels.	3. The standards set a <u>rigorous path of high expectations</u> for students at each grade level.	4. The majority of the standards in this strand can be <u>assessed in the classroom and/or on a state assessment</u> .	5. The standards in this strand are <u>understandable</u> to educators and explainable to parents and other stakeholders.	6. The standards in this strand represent the necessary content for a student to reach <u>college and/or career readiness upon graduation</u> .	7. The standards in this strand are <u>accurate and encompass the breadth of the content</u> .	Overall comments regarding the proposed standards:
Document Shaping Constitutional Democracy	K - 2								
	3	4 - Seems VERY abstract when getting into state-level government	4 - Does build sequentially but not developmentally. 3rd grade was to be state focused but when comparing/contrasting to the national	4 - because of the abstract nature, this seem too rigorous	4 - This is not project based, rather constructed response.	4 - Too general/broad, not sure which areas of the topic to cover from one grade level to the next	4 - Does seem to be rigorous but, again, very deep for the third grade level	According to whom or what?	The number of standards needed to be covered have been overwhelmingly increased

			level it is necessary to teach both in order to truly have the understanding for comparing/contrasting.						
	4	4	4	4 - outside the realm of their cognitive understanding.	1	3 - too complex for parents and stakeholders	1	4 - these concepts go way too deep. (ie. inalienable rights, redress of grievances)	
	5	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	Some of these seem like they might be hard to assess. I am also concerned that some standards are a bit vague or broad for parents
Governance Systems	K - 2								
	3	4	4	4 - too rigorous	4	4 - GS.2.D.3 can be understood. The others are very difficult to comprehend.	4	?	
	4	4	4	4 - outside the realm of their cognitive understanding	4 - cannot assess	4 - standards are way too broad	3	3	
	5	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	Confused of analyzing peaceful

									resolution of disputes of courts. Also confused on what you mean by authoritative decisions.
History	K - 2								
	3	2	2	1	1	1	1		
	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	5	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	I like the history part of the standards. Easy to understand.
Economics	K - 2								
	3	4 - E.4.C.3.a down through E.4.D.3. These seem to be very abstract for 3rd graders.	2	4 - stated on number 1.	2	4 - due to the last few already mentioned. (tax generation, cost analysis benefit)	3		
	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	5	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	
Geographic Study	K - 2								
	3	2 - EG.5.C.3.b: Way too broad	3	2	4 - (EG.5.C.3.b)	2	2		
	4	4	4	4	1	4	4	4	The geography is too broad for a 4th grader.
	5	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	
People,	K								

Groups, & Cultures	- 2								
	3	4 - Too broad and hits beyond Missouri history.	4	4	4	4 - This strand is overwhelming and encompasses many ideas and makes it difficult to know how to go about teaching the concepts. Can't really pinpoint the important parts of the broad concepts to teach.	4		
	4	4	4 - standards do not follow a coherent path through 4th grade	2	4	4 - too difficult, standard do not make sense	4	3	
	5	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	
Tools of Social Science Inquiry	K - 2								
	3	4 - TS.7.A.3.a-Primary vs Secondary sources are too abstract for third graders.	4	4	4	4 - (TS.7.A.3.a is too abstract)	4		
	4	4	4	2	4	4 - stakeholders will not understand standards	3	4	
	5	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	My only concern with the changes to the standards

									is not having the materials to teach it and time to teach it all. I love the time period and content, but worry about fitting it all in and finding necessary resources.
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Please use the following scale to provide feedback & provide any suggested revisions for standards:

1	2	3	4
Standards are acceptable as is. Overall the standards are listed at the appropriate grade level.	Standards are acceptable, edits would improve, but are not mandatory. Very few (minor) issues.	Standards are acceptable <i>after</i> they are revised as suggested immediately below.	Standards require complete rewrite. Majority of standards are at <i>inappropriate</i> grade levels

Social Studies 6-12									
Strand	G R A D E	1. The standards in this strand are <u>developmentally appropriate</u> .	2. The standards in this strand follow a <u>coherent path</u> through and across all grade levels.	3. The standards set a <u>rigorous path</u> of high expectations for students at each grade level.	4. The majority of the standards in this strand can be <u>assessed in the classroom</u> and/or on a <u>state assessment</u> .	5. The standards in this strand are <u>understandable</u> to educators and explainable to parents and other stakeholders.	6. The standards in this strand represent the necessary content for a student to reach <u>college and/or career readiness upon graduation</u> .	7. The standards in this strand are <u>accurate and encompass the breadth of the content</u> .	Overall comments regarding the proposed standards:
History: Continuity & Change	O M S	1	1	1	1	2 - could be more specific and measurable	1	1	At times, wording is nonspecific
	O H S	1	1	1	1	2 - Clarification may be need to explain these standards to stakeholders.	1	1	
Government Systems & Principles	O M S	1	1	1	2 - concern that some of the objectives are broad-how will new teachers know the specifics for testing; or the consistency of	2 - could be more specific and measurable	1	1	

					teachers across the board				
	O H S	2-Except T3S2B Standard B which requires mastery of both Articles of Confederation and the Constitution in order to compare to ideals present in the Declaration of Independence. This could be done at a basic level with some sophomores and a more advanced level with others.	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Geographical Study	O M S	1	1	1	2 - again some non-specific language for the US History	2 - language non-specific	1	1	
	O H S	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	These standards are most applicable in chapters that examine voting practices and representation (apportionment, gerrymandering)
Economic Concepts	O M S	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	O H S	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	More clarification is needed on standard T1S4A in order to

									properly teach content. Does this strand refer to opportunity cost in campaign finance, the federal budget, local budgets, interest group treasuries?
People, Groups, & Cultures	O M S	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	O H S	1	1	1	1	1	1		

From: [1490Comments](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: FW: Comments from Knox County High School Teachers
Date: Wednesday, December 09, 2015 12:59:17 PM
Attachments: [Comments on HB1490 workgroups.docx](#)

From: Brown, Brian [mailto:brian.brown@knoxr1.us]
Sent: Wednesday, December 02, 2015 2:32 PM
To: 1490Comments
Subject: Comments from Knox County High School Teachers

Please see attached document.

Thank you.

--

Brian Brown
Principal
Knox County R-1 High School

Comments on HB1490:

1. I think the variety of individuals to serve on the work groups will allow for a diverse range of opinion and viewpoints which will allow for the standards to be well-rounded.
2. Not necessarily a comment about the house bill or standards, but I think it would be beneficial to attend the public hearings about the revisions of the standards - would be a good PD opportunity and chance for continued ed.
3. As a vocational instructor that does not have a set standard represented in this HB and accompanying documents, I appreciate that the standards are broken into subsets that are easy for me to use to crosswalk with my current standards and curriculum. As I am writing new curriculum now it has made it fairly easy to transition some of the old into the new.
4. I do not see much difference in the standards that have been proposed and the pre-existing standards that will affect the choices I use for standards that fit in my curriculum, however in the data available to myself (crosswalks provided for certain courses through the DESE curriculum links) I have noticed they are vary subtle differences. For myself - this is handy and comforting while trying to re-write curriculum.

Proposed Standard -

RL.2.9-10 Determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in the text, including figurative and connotative meanings.

CCS-

RL.9- 10.4 Determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in the text, including figurative and connotative meanings; analyze the cumulative impact of specific word choices on meaning and tone (e.g., how the language evokes a sense of time and place; how it sets a formal or informal tone).

I feel if this standard is broadened to what the proposed standard states students will miss out on the analyzing portion of figurative and connotative language. They will miss out of important conversations needed to help students understand how words can be used in multiple ways and how these uses can impact a text.

Proposed Standard-

RI.11.9- 10 Analyze how multiple texts reflect the historical and/or cultural contexts.

RI.11.9- 10 Analyze how multiple texts reflect the historical and/or cultural contexts.

I like that they have added these standards in. I personally already teach multiple texts over several historical events, however, I could see how other teachers may not hit multiple texts without this standard. It is vital to look at different point of views over one event and have discussions over how these pov's affect the readers.

Proposed Standard-

RI.10.9- 10 Evaluate how effectively two or more texts develop similar ideas/topics.

Current Standard-

RI.9- 10.9 Analyze seminal U.S. documents of historical and literary significance (e.g., Washington's Farewell Address, the Gettysburg Address, Roosevelt's Four Freedoms speech, King's "Letter from Birmingham Jail"), including how they address related themes and concepts.

I like how this standard has been broadened and allows the teacher to choose texts that our students can better relate too. I also like how the writing standards have been written. Several CCS standards have been combined, as well as the standard focusing on editing has been written with more detail.

-
1. I noticed that there appears to be a shift from memorization and rote learning to more hands-on and creative learning.

2. There are less standards here than were on the old CLE's.
 3. It appears they have incorporated STEM components as well as interdisciplinary tie-ins.
-

1. I am glad to see that government has its own standards and that we are no longer lumped in together with Language Arts.

2. I like the fact that a citizen's personal responsibility is part of the standards.

3. I also like the fact that having political differences are worked into the standards.

Overall I view the new learning standards as being too vague in terms of the materials we are to cover in secondary Language Arts classes.

Many of the proposed reading standards seem to leave the content to be instructed up to the teacher, which could create an issue with uniformity in the curricula.

The proposed writing standard (WR.2.11-12) does not emphasize the techniques we should encourage students to develop, rather condensing the standard down to a short grab-bag of potential techniques to cover or blend.

- 1) I think they are similar to the NEXT Generation Science Standards
 - 2) A lot of project based and creation of models
 - 3) Requires more higher level thinking
-

The introductory statements for the themes are very informative and naturally break the standards into units unlike before where the standards would be used multiple times and have different meanings with each unit.

The possible sources of study that come with each theme is a great resource to find primary and secondary sources.

The proposed standards are the same as previous standards however the key concepts are much more detailed and easier to follow.

As I browsed the proposed standards, I did not find anything regarding the other courses that are offered which I believe play a big role in the education of students. In order for all to be "on the same page" I think it is crucial to also include elective classes like foreign language, P.E, art, etc.

From what I have seen, it looks like some of the previous standards are being simplified while others are getting added with so much information. That makes it confusing to understand what the actual expectation is.

Section 160.518. 2 states that "....assessment system shall only permit the academic performance of students in each school in the state to be tracked against prior academic performance in the same school. How will that work for students that transfer late in the school year?"

A1.NQ.A.1 - Language seems very specific as related to rational exponents and as compared to other domain standards. It is also a standard that is addressed in Algebra II. My concern is that these standards (A.1 and A.2) go beyond Algebra I.

A1.NQ.A.2 - Same as above.

Standards A1.CED.B.4 through B.7 - All contain concrete language that is readily understandable.

Overall, the new standards do a better job of defining the standards and adding specificity to their meanings. The CCS were, in general, more vague in their descriptions of the standard.

A2.SSE.D.14 - Appreciated the clearer language and specific expectations about logarithms

G.CP.B.7 - This standard lays out the expectation for understanding and applying the Addition Rule for probabilities. I feel like there should be a similar standard for the Multiplication Rule for probabilities, but it's sort of unclearly described in the conditional probability rules instead.

The geometry standards in general: "Theorems should include the following:" - does this mean those are the only theorems that should be included, or are there others and those are just examples?

From: [Florence, Linda](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on Standards
Date: Tuesday, December 01, 2015 4:51:32 PM

Here are my few comments relating to the standards.

ELA--

I appreciate how the standards are organized in that format. It makes it easy to look at individual standards across the grade levels.

I like the changes that have been made to the different kinds of reading (poetry, drama, etc.) It appears that we are encouraging students to spend more time reading!

I think breaking down the listening and speaking into the categories is helpful also.

Math--

I don't care for the lay out of the standards in math. It seems a little complicated to follow.

Some of the standards are difficult to follow (too wordy). Although I do think it is important to be specific within the standards.

I do like the appendix information within the math.

Science/Social Studies--

I appreciate the standards being organized.

Thanks to those that have put in the work on the standards.
Linda

From: [1490Comments](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: FW: Liberty Public Schools Teacher Feedback on HB1490 Proposals
Date: Wednesday, December 09, 2015 12:26:49 PM
Attachments: [LPS HB1490 Feedback Nov 2015.docx](#)

Julie Boeckmann | Communications Technician | Communications | 573.751.3469 | dese.mo.gov

From: Jeanette Westfall [mailto:jwestfall@liberty.k12.mo.us]
Sent: Tuesday, November 24, 2015 1:43 PM
To: 1490Comments
Subject: Liberty Public Schools Teacher Feedback on HB1490 Proposals

To Whom It May Concern:

Thank you for considering Liberty teacher input in your curriculum review and alignment next steps. We will also send this submission as certified mail with the USPS.

With respect,

Dr. Jeanette Westfall
Director of Curriculum, Instruction & Staff Development
Liberty 53 School District
8 Victory Lane
Liberty, MO 64068
(816) 736-5320

Inspire. Invest. Innovate.



Date: December 20, 2015

To: Missouri State Board of Education

Liberty Public Schools has worked collaboratively in grade level and content area teacher teams to review the HB1490 Work Groups submissions. We appreciate the opportunity to offer our feedback to the continued work on the K-12 curriculum standards.

Our teachers, staff, and community members have been encouraged to submit input on-line, but many of our instructional staff also felt the need to submit additional information as a collective. Their feedback and input is included with this letter.

Thank you for listening to our teachers and including their thinking in the next iteration of the curriculum to be presented to the Board of Education. We would be honored for you to consider our work. Additionally, if DESE creates any additional teacher work groups to refine the input from stakeholders, Liberty teachers are eager to help. Please let us know if we can be of any assistance.

With deep respect,

/s/ Jeanette Westfall

Jeanette Westfall, EdD
Director of Curriculum, Instruction & Staff Development
Liberty Public Schools #53

Dr. Jeanette Westfall

8 Victory Lane, Liberty, MO 64068
Phone: 816.736.6486 E-Mail: jwestfall@liberty.k12.mo.us

Liberty Public Schools #53 Instructional Staff Feedback by Content

High School Science:

The level of rigor and organization of the proposed standards (Grades 6 – 12) is significantly improved from the science standards previously adopted by DESE. Whereas the current standards are very knowledge-based, the proposed standards require that students apply higher-level thinking in science coursework. The three-dimensional learning practices that form the basis of the middle and high school standards will cause a shift in thinking among educators. This should significantly improve science education in the state of Missouri and will serve to prepare our students for the future, as this design integrates Disciplinary Core Ideas, Cross-Cutting Concepts, and Science & Engineering Practices into a cohesive structure for science instruction.

One example of an improvement in the standards is the requirement that students “...apply concepts of statistics and probability...” As this is an essential skill in scientific thinking, it is very impressive to see this overtly stated in the proposed standards. For too long, we have considered some science courses as requiring “no math” when mathematical concepts are essential to ALL areas of science. Other standards include the phrase “construct an argument based on evidence...” which is another critical scientific literacy skill. Constructing arguments and applying mathematical concepts will lead to higher levels of performance by all students. Further, it is anticipated that the proposed standards will also allow more students across the state to have an authentic laboratory experience in which they have opportunities to collect, analyze and report data. The organization of the new Missouri Learning Standards will require the integration of science practices throughout the course.

In an effort to provide the most comprehensive and cohesive model for science instruction in Missouri, it is suggested that the proposed elementary science standards receive additional review by educators to ensure that they work in tandem with the proposed middle and secondary standards to provide for thorough and rigorous science education for Missouri students. We believe the committee has made a good start with the elementary standards but that they need some reorganization to meet the needs of students.

High School Social Studies: There are slight concerns over some of the testing implications due to the increased vagueness in the proposed standards for government. There is also a clear shift away from economics and a change in emphasis on the philosophers that influenced the development of constitutional governments that I don’t quite understand the reason for.

In world history, there is more of an emphasis on world history as opposed to European history, which I think is a good change. It is odd, however, why they choose to specifically focus on civilizations like the Gupta but then vaguely address East Asia and the Islamic Empires.

Government:

Theme 1 Strand 4: want to make sure we are talking about “opportunity costs” and benefits, not “costs” and benefits. Can be a little confusing

Theme 2 Strand 2: might want to add primary sources for Enlightenment Thinkers on Social Contract. Hobbes, Montesquieu, Locke, & Rousseau were heavily featured before. Not sure why the shift away from them.

Theme 3: mentions “Seminal Supreme Court Cases” for primary sources they would recommend. Would like to know which cases the state feels are seminal.

US History:

Theme 6: there is a concern that the history is too new to effectively “analyze” or “evaluate” and that lower levels of Bloom’s Taxonomy should dominate this theme

General questions:

Why aren’t Essential Questions provided by the state to guide instruction?

Possible primary and secondary sources: are these merely suggestions or are they tied to EOCs (particularly Government since this is the only one currently tested)? In other words, are those documents referenced in state tests?

High School Mathematics:

Algebra 1

Standard: A1.IF.C.7- Graph functions, including simple piecewise defined functions (linear, simple quadratic and simple exponential), from their symbolic representation and show key features of the graph both by hand and by using technology.

Proposed change: Omit piecewise functions, or change to interpreting given piecewise functions (not graphing)

Rationale: Time would be better spent focusing on a deep understanding of the three types of functions. This is covered in upper level courses, and is very conceptually difficult for what is typically a freshmen level class.

Standard: All of Data and Statistical Analysis Domain

Proposed change: Significantly reduced or omitted from this course. (Keep scatterplots with linear relationships)

Rationale: Student have calculated measure of central tendency and represented data in different graphical representations in previous grades. Determining residuals from lines of fit, relative frequencies, and in depth analysis are far above what an average citizen would need to know to be able to make informed decisions, and several of these items are covered in Algebra 2. Putting so much focus on this unit uses considerable time that would be better spent on developing a deep understanding of Algebra, which is key for success in any future course.

Standard: A1.REI.C.9def- Solve mathematical and real-world problems involving quadratic equations in one variable. (methods: completing the square, quadratic formula, square roots, factoring; derive quadratic formula).

Proposed change: Omit completing the square, focus on solving by factoring and only simple quadratics ($ax^2 + c = 0$) for solving.

Rationale: There is simply not enough time to realistically cover everything listed in the school year. Quadratics are covered extensively in Algebra 2. An introduction to basics is all that is necessary and feasible in Algebra 1. Derivation of the quadratic formula is very difficult, even for upper level students, and is too overwhelming for freshmen or younger students!

Geometry

Standard: G.SRT.A.1a - Verify experimentally the properties of dilations given by a center and scale factor: A dilation takes a line not passing through the center of the dilation to a parallel line, and leaves a line passing through the center unchanged.

Proposed change: Omit

Rationale: A minute detail that does not impact students' understanding of properties of dilations given by a center and a scale factor.

Standard: Probability Domain

Proposed change: Omit

Rationale: It is typically covered in Algebra II. Not enough time to get to this before testing.

Standard: G.S.RT.B.4 Prove theorems about triangles. (Theorems should include: a line parallel to one side of a triangle divides the other two side proportionally, and conversely, the Pythagorean Theorem proved using triangle similarity.

Proposed change: change prove theorems to use theorems

Rationale: It is more important to be able to use the concept correctly than spend time proving it.

Algebra 2

Standard: A2.APR.A.4 - Understand the Remainder Theorem: For a polynomial $p(x)$ and a number a , the remainder on division of $p(x)$ by $(x-a)$ is $p(a)$, so $p(a) = 0$ if and only if $(x-a)$ is a factor of $p(x)$.

Proposed Change: Omit

Rationale: This is typically covered in Precalculus and College Algebra courses

Standards: Data and Statistical Analysis Domain

Proposed Change: Omit

Rationale: If the state test for juniors is going to be the ACT, data analysis and statistics are not tested on the ACT. As Algebra 2 is a course taken predominantly by juniors, we feel other standards should be considered, such as sequences and series and trigonometry. Sequences and patterns are commonly seen on the ACT, as well as simple trigonometry and Law of Sines and Law of Cosines. The Law of Sines and Law of Cosines are not included in the Geometry standards, but are tested on the ACT.

Standards: Review of Trigonometry, specifically addressing Law of Sines and Law of Cosines

Proposed Change: Add

Rationale: See above regarding the ACT Test. Copy and paste as necessary.

Standards: Sequences and Patterns

Proposed Change: Add

Rationale: See above regarding the ACT Test. Copy and paste as necessary.

Middle School Social Studies

Grade Levels Taught	Standards to Address	Proposed Changes
6th	The current standards that we address are what students are capable of grasping and understanding especially when 6th grade is really the first year they are exposed to concentrated social studies class.	At present the students level of engagement is high because of the standards and present curriculum that we teach.
6th		Word History Theme 1 = 6th through 8th World History Theme 2 and 3 = 6th World History Theme 4 = 7th Geography = 6th through 8th
6th/7th	We would like to see more an emphasis on the World Geography Standards. We would also like to see the standards that correlate Japan, Mayans, Incan, African Empires emphasized in the curriculum.	We would like to see the World Geography standards incorporated with the World History standards.
6th/8th	MS World History Theme 1- all social studies classes Themes 2-3 = 6th Grade Themes 4-5 = 7th Grade MS Geography Themes 1-2 - all social studies classes MS American History - all themes = 8th grade	The MS World History course expectations are not realistic for a one year course. Many of the geography standards are integrated into history expectations. Split World History into 2 courses and integrate geography.
7th	Geography is substantially shorter than other strands. Is there a recommended timeline? Could Geography be blended in with the world and US history?	
7th	The World History Theme 1 and 2 standards need to be merged with the Geography Theme 1 and 2 standards as they are repetitive and should be combined.	I would like to see middle school world history and geography course expectations combined as the 6th and 7th grade courses are set up now. Having worked at another local district that did not combine the geography and world history course expectations, I observed the students only received an education on ancient Greece and Egypt.

Middle School Mathematics:

After having some good discussion about this yesterday at our meeting, the teachers said that there was nothing that they thought needed to be changed and they actually liked some of the new wording in the standards better.

Middle School Science:

Praise:

- We appreciate the level of quality resources used to create these standards.
- We appreciate that performance expectations from A Framework for K-12 Science Education as that brings the standards from a DOK 1 and 2 to a more appropriate DOK 3 and 4.
- We noticed and appreciate that amount of content has been shortened while deepening the content that was kept.
- We are excited that the standards now include multiple opportunities to tie in engineering, technology, and relevant careers.

Concerns:

- It is felt that the STATE will need to delineate where each learning standard is taught to ensure that transient students have a consistent education when moving rather than leaving it up to each district which standards should be taught at each grade. We are concerned that the standards do not currently include grade level delineation. Thinking about the ability of 11-14 year old children to cognitively grasp abstract concepts and then further analyze and apply, there are DOK expectations included in the standards that are clearly better aligned to 8th graders rather than 6th graders. We would encourage the committee not to take a “one size fits all” approach children in 6th–8th grades as the standards are currently presented. This will also help transient students to have a consistent experience at any Missouri school and not miss/repeat content.
- Amount of time to get through standards
- Amount of background knowledge to even address goal

MS Science Standard-by-Standard Feedback:

- MSPS1-1. Develop models to describe the atomic composition of simple molecules and extended structures. (Organic chemistry, too high???)
- MSLS1-3. Develop an argument supported by evidence for how multicellular organisms are organized by varying levels of complexity; cells, tissue, organs, organ systems. (How can this be augmented?)
- MSLS4-4. Interpret graphical representations to support explanations of how natural selection may lead to increases and decreases of specific traits in populations over time. (Will data be provided to support teachers in teaching standards that required data to teach?)
- The word “model” implies a physical model. This either needs to be reworded or clarified to ensure teachers don’t go back to “cakes of cell models” as this does not teach a standard that asked to compare/contrast organelles.
- MS-PS3-1- The clarification statement does not clarify. It is very confusing!
- MS-PE3-3 How will this be assessed on a state level test?
- MS-PS3-4 and 5 I do not think these are 7th grade level questions. These are asking for some pretty high level thinking and implying lots of background knowledge in order to get to this high level.

- MS-ESS1-1 In the clarification it talks about models can be “physical, graphical or conceptual” how does that clarify anything? Perhaps it should define if the model is merely to reproduce the system or is the goal to explain the relationship between the Earth, Sun and Moon?
- MS-ESS1-2 Same as above.
- MS-ESS1-4 Is it really necessary to have this objective? Seems a bit out of place.
- MS-ESS1-5 I don’t think this fits at all with this thread. This is more geologic history and fossil evidence. Having this objective here leads me to think we are to talk about the formation of the universe which unless you have super current information (not text book) you will be wrong and teaching vastly outdated material. If the intention is to teach the Big Bang or other widely accepted and scientifically backed theories of the formation of the universe then that needs to be stated. Personally, I’m ok with it because having those conversations allows students to see that science is constantly evolving and hopefully this realization would eliminate the “science keeps changing their mind” thought.
- We question why the current Missouri Learning Standards for human body systems has been deleted. The Missouri state Health standards do not address some of the process introductions needed for students to be successful in biology. Specific examples include the process of nutrients passing through a semi-permeable membrane of a cell and the cell’s ability to turn that into energy.
- We are wondering if leaving out specific references to scientists of the past (I.e. Newton) was intentional and if so – why? We think that starting with a historical perspective gives students insight into the discoveries of these scientific laws and theories

Elementary Social Studies:

Kindergarten

(Not in proposed standards) PPG.2.A Participate in a democratic decision making processes. *I think it would be good for kids to have a chance to practice/learn what it means to vote. We do this every year on Election Day.

H.3.B.K.b Compare your family in the past and present. * I don’t think kindergarteners have enough life perspective to do this.

The following are all new to K-I’m not sure K’s have enough life perspective for the depth of these! Not developmentally appropriate standards for 5-6 year olds in my opinion.

RI.6.A.K Describe cultural characteristics of your family and class members (e.g., language, celebrations, customs, holidays, artistic expression, food, dress, & traditions).

Ideas and beliefs of different cultures

RI.6.C.K Share stories related to your family cultural traditions and family lore. Cultural heritage and preservation

RI.6.D.4 Describe how you and your family remember and commemorate your cultural heritage. the world?

First Grade

During 4th qtr. writer's workshop, 1st graders are supposed to write non-fiction pieces. They are no longer covering famous Americans during social studies in a way that is integrated between academic subjects. The famous Americans covered according the standards are related to holidays. This significantly decreases the number of famous Americans taught and therefore limits the number of famous Americans researched and written about.

We feel comfortable with the other items listed.

Second Grade

Geographical Study

EG.5.A.2.a. Read and construct maps with title and key (regions of state, U.S., world)

I feel that at our level, being able to construct a map with title and key is developmentally appropriate. I think maybe being able to locate our state on a map is okay, but not sure on details of the world?

ES 5.B.2.a Name and locate regions of the world (continents, oceans, hemispheres) I think having students locate and name oceans and continents and not hemispheres.

I really think understanding relationships between and among regions is a little over 2nd grade. Maybe focusing in on Missouri alone and then able to build on it to compare regions in 3rd grade?

I think they have added a lot to what we already do and some seem to overlap as well.

Fourth Grade

Agree

GOVERNMENT

Functions of governmental systems makes sense (state to federal and then to compare)

HISTORY

K - George Washington, Abe Lincoln

1st - MLK, Thomas Jefferson, Christopher Columbus

2nd - Inventors or Pioneers

3rd - Famous Missourians

4th - Significant individuals of 1800

5th - Significant individuals

1800-1940

ECONOMICS

Stayed the same

GEOGRAPHY

matches the government

CULTURE STUDY

New, but agree

SOCIAL SCIENCE INQUIRY

Same

QuestionableHISTORY

Civil War is introduced in third (gained 4th grades exact standard) then built in 5th. ?Why is this skipping 4th?

Why are the standards in history not introduced in chronological order?

Example, goes from Civil War(3rd), American Rev.(4th), back to Civil War(5th)

Student won't see the connections between time periods of time because events are taught out of chronological order

*Concerned with topics being taught out of chronological order

Why do our history standards stop at 1940

Suggestion - Organize history standards chronologically

GEOGRAPHY

State level to national level

Elementary ELA:Writing Standards

Grade	Standard	Proposed Change (addition, deletion, modification in language, level or alignment)	Rationale for Change
5	Writing 1Db	Change two pages to one page.	Time doesn't allow for students to publish two pages. Very few pieces of our writing exceed five paragraphs.
5	Writing 3An	Bibliography - delete this	Intro/practice occurs with LMS; not age appropriate in classroom when the students are citing in their text.
5	Language 1Ab	Parts of speech - move to younger grade	Identify and use noun, pronoun, verb, adjective and adverb should occur earlier in elementary school
5	Language 1Bi	Apostrophes	Where did this previously occur?

Language Standards:

K	1Da	Give examples of digital tools	This would be helpful.
	1Bf	Use "reads" instead of "recognize" how to understand	The word recognize could cause confusion--what does it mean (spelling, reading, etc)
	1Bf	Use "reads" instead of "recognize" how to understand	The word recognize could cause confusion--what does it mean

Elementary Science:

Kindergarten feedback:

PS2B Observe that magnets cause some objects to move without touching them.

Recommendation: Move to 3rd grade

PS4A Compare and Contrast different sounds

Identify sounds and their source of vibration in everyday life.

Identify the ear as a receiver of vibrations that produce sounds.

Recommendation: Move to 1st grade

First Grade feedback:

PS3A Compare the temperature of hot and cold objects using a simple thermometer.

PS3B Identify sources of thermal energy

PS4B Identify the source of energy causes an increase in temperature of an object.

Recommendations: Move to 2nd grade

Second Grade feedback:

PS4-A Plan and conduct investigations to provide evidence that changes in vibration create change in sound.

Demonstrate that vibrating materials can create sounds and that sound can make materials vibrate.

Describe how the ear serves as a receiver of sounds.

Identify air, water and solids as media that sound travels through.

Recommendations: Move to 1st grade

Third Grade feedback:

ESS1B Explain how the sun's position in the sky and the Earth's rotation affect the length and direction of shadows.

Observe and identify the moon is visible because it reflect light.

Describe how the sun, moon and stars appears to move slowly across the sky from east to west during the day and/or night due to the rotations of the Earth

Explain that the changing shape of the moon during positions of the earth, moon and sun rather than due to the Earth's shadow falling on the moon.

Identify the three things (light source, object and surface) necessary to produce a shadow.

Identify the Earth rotates on its axis once every 24 hours.

Recommendation: Move to 1st grade

PS1B Construct an argument with evidence that some changes caused by heating or cooling can be reversed and some cannot.

PS3B Identify sources of thermal energy (sun, stove, tire, body) that can cause solids to change to liquids and liquids to change to gas.

Recommendation: Move to 2nd grade

Fourth Grade feedback:

PS2A Make observation and or measurement of an objects motion to provide evidence that a pattern can be used to predict future motion

Plan and conduct an investigation to provide evidence of the effects of balanced and unbalanced forces on the motion of an object.

Recommendation: Move to third grade

PS2B Predict how changes in either the amount of force applied to an object or the mass of the object affects the motion (speed and direction) of the object

Observe the balanced forces do not affect an object's motion

Describe how unbalanced forces acting on an object changes its speed (faster/slower), direction of motion, or both.

Recommendation: Move to third grade

Fifth Grade feedback:

No change recommendations

From: [1490Comments](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: FW: proposed standards - math
Date: Wednesday, December 09, 2015 11:20:09 AM

From: Betsy Donnell [mailto:bdonnell@doniphanr1.k12.mo.us]
Sent: Wednesday, November 04, 2015 9:41 AM
To: 1490Comments
Subject: proposed standards

I feel like our language and math standards for 4th grade seem like exactly what we need. I like how specific each standard is and how they are laid out. The math standards also seem reasonable for the age group, and are laid out in a very user friendly manner. I am extremely concerned with the lack of science standards for fourth grade, and the shift in grade level for the standards in Social Studies. I feel the concepts that they are planning on teaching for 4th grade in civics are far too advanced. I understand the need to have a little more contemporary history at the elementary level for 5th grade. However, if a shift is made in standards from one grade to the lower grade the subject matter could change without the objectives themselves being too advanced.

Sincerely,
Betsy Donnell

From: [Madsen, Danielle](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on the Missouri Learning Standards 6th-Algebra 2
Date: Tuesday, November 03, 2015 2:15:36 PM

Fourteen teachers from the Northeast Missouri Region met from 7 districts to discuss the proposed Missouri Learning Standards as part of our local Math Consortium organized through our RPCD.

1. Are students going to be required to memorize formulas such as the Pythagorean theorem, Area of a circle, distance formula, etc or will they be given a formula sheet for state testing?
2. 7.GM.B.4 A-D What does it mean? Could you provide examples? What does it mean by explore? That is not a DOK level, so we believe it is unclear at what level our students need to understand this concept.
3. 6.DSP.B.5-7.DSP.B.3-4 Mean Absolute Deviation. Students are capable to do the process, but do not understand how to interpret the concept. Also, it is not covered in any of our textbooks. We are willing to supplement, but do not understand the purpose of 6th and 7th graders knowing this skill.
4. 7.DSP.C.8 There are two letter d's and a, b, c. Did the simple events concept move down to a lower grade?
5. 8.EE1.A.2 Cubed roots to 1000 seems very advanced for 8th grade students as they are just becoming comfortable with square roots.
6. 8.EE1.A.4 Could we consider moving scientific notation to science where better real-world application could be applied to the concept?
7. 8.EE.1.C.8 Solving systems graphically and substitution seems reasonable when introducing systems, but elimination may be too advanced for just 8th grade students. We agree the Algebra I students should understand all these methods. Also, arriving no solution and infinite solutions in a system seems advanced for 8th grade students beyond identifying it on a graph.
8. 8.F.B.4 For x-intercepts, it would be appropriate to identify from a graph, but maybe not an equation when they just learned slope, slope-intercept, etc.
9. 8.F.B.5 Discrete vs. Discontinuous? All of our textbooks use the word discrete and believe discrete and discontinuous are not synonyms.
10. 8.GM.A.1 a. Verify that lines are mapped of lines. What does that mean? Could an example be provided?
11. 8.GM.C.9 Are formulas given?
12. 8.DSP.A.3 Is the linear equation given?
13. A1.NQ.B.3 Formatting f,f no a,b,c. Vocabulary varies-- conversion factor, unit multiplier,

dimensional analysis. Does capacity mean volume or something else?

14. A1.NQ.B.5 Approximate accuracy? Do the students have to approximate accuracy of anything besides money?

15. A1.SSE.A.1 Vague, not sure concept. We can only understand the standard by looking at the crosswalk.

16. A1.SSE.A.3 Will students be required to find max and min only by completing the square or can they use another method?

17. A1.REI.C.8 Why is the solve standard missing?

18. A1.REI.C.9 What is the purpose of students being able to derive the quadratic formula? We think it is more appropriate for the students to solve problems using the quadratic equation. "Complex solutions" is advanced for Algebra I. We feel that "complex solutions" is beyond the level of understanding that Algebra students would be able to grasp.

19. A1.ARP.F.18 Divide polynomials by monomials. We believe this should be kept in Algebra II and not moved down to Algebra I. If it is moved to Algebra I, we believe that the standard should be explained to what extent/level the student must know this concept.

20. A1.DS.A.1 Box plots is not common language. We feel box-and-whisker plots would be a better choice.

21. A1.DS.A.2 Standard deviation seems too high for Algebra I students.

22. A1.DS.A.5 Using technology-- not all students have access to graphing calculator.

23. There were many document formatting issues throughout. Including lettering, periods, etc.

24. A2.IF.A.1 Describe graph end behaviors via verbal descriptions or symbolically?

25. Perimeter is used in all grades, but only addressed in 3rd, 4th and Geometry.

26. Mean and Average is not in the standards. It is only covered under Measures of Center in 6th grade. We feel mean/average is a skill that needs to be covered in more than 6th grade.

Thanks!

Danielle

--

Danielle Madsen

Matthew Middle School

Wolverine Team

8th Grade Math & Math Projects

[My Classroom Website](http://www.donorschoose.org/mrsdmadsen)

<http://www.donorschoose.org/mrsdmadsen>

Kirksville R-III School District Mail System

This mail system is for educational use only. All other use is forbidden.

All contents of this system including email messages will remain the property of the Kirksville R-III School District. All users of this email system should consider its content public records. The Kirksville R-III School District reserves the right to monitor all users of this system and audit its content.

Email processed by Google mail.

From: [Tracy Lohmeier](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Math standards
Date: Saturday, October 31, 2015 2:42:16 PM

To whom it may concern,

Good morning! My name is Tracy Lohmeier and I am in my 25th year of teaching high school mathematics; everything from pre-algebra to honors and dual credit Precalculus, college algebra and trigonometry. I certainly don't claim to know everything about what students need to know to be successful in high school mathematics however, I can tell you with certainty both from a parent's perspective and a veteran teacher's perspective that our children are not learning the basic prereqs needed for high school math, and it gets worse by the year. Students are being taught "algebra and geometry" in grade school, yet they can't perform basic operations with fractions without their calculators! I have high school students who don't know their multiplication facts and some students who will still resort to their calculator for arithmetic as basic as 3 times 2, for example. There is little hope that I can be successful in teaching my students to work with rational "algebraic" expressions if they don't even know how to work with simple numerical fractions.

Is rather discouraging, to say the least!

I've somewhat jokingly said to colleagues over the years that I just wish I could get incoming 9th graders who knew well how to (and understand those processes critically) add, subtract, multiply and divide whole numbers and fractions and I could teach the rest! I readily admit that leaves a great deal for me to teach but I believe strongly that I could do that if I didn't have to spend so much time re teaching basic arithmetic with whole numbers and fractions.

Every Time our state standards are changed, as classroom teachers, we spend so much time trying to understand the new and not-necessarily-improved standards that we are wasting valuable instructional time. It's irrational that we are expected to teach things such as arithmetic and geometric sequences and series to algebra I students when they don't even know their times tables. Arithmetic and geometric sequences and series are currently taught in college algebra B but are still topics included in my college algebra syllabus and the level of difficulty of the problems is not that different.

Please, please, please lessen the amount of time spent in grade school on reasoning and just make sure you send us freshmen who can manipulate fractions and whole numbers!!!! Or at least get our post-secondary counterparts on board with common core so that our Algebra B students are not learning the same thing as my honors precalculus!

Please ask more current public high school teachers for input! I don't believe your board of advisors adequately represents the people who are in the classroom day in and day out dealing with the children.

I invite any one of you to visit my classroom at CHS and observe with your own eyes what is truly going on.

Respectfully,
Tracy Lohmeier

Sent from my iPhone